REMARKS

Claims 1, 14, 26, 38, 49, and 51 are rejected by the examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 14, 26, 38, and 51 have been amended for clarification purposes and are now believed to be allowable.

Claim 1 is rejected by the examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is being anticipated by Colmenero (US 4365245). This rejections is respectfully traversed.

It is noted that claim 1 has been amended for clarification purposes in order to more fully defined scope of the present invention. As amended, claim 1 is directed to a method for detecting active ports of a sequencer. The method comprises automatically identifying a first port as an active port in response to a determination that an external component is connected to the first port; automatically identifying the first port as an inactive port in response to a determination that no external component is connected to the first port; and sequencing only a first portion of ports of the sequencer which have been identified as active ports.

The examiner states on page 3 of the office action that Colmenero discloses automatically identifying active ports which are physically connected to an external load, citing column 4, lines 49-55 in support. This assertion is respectfully traversed. There is no teaching or suggestion in Colmenero column 4, lines 49-55 of the features relating to automatic detection of active and/or inactive ports of a sequencer as defined, for example, in amended claim 1.

The examiner also states on page 3 of the office action that Colmenero discloses sequencing only desired active ports of the electronic device, citing column 4, lines 23-28 in support. This assertion is respectfully traversed. There is no teaching or suggestion in Colmenero column 4, lines 23-28 of the features relating to the sequencing of only a first portion of ports of the sequencer which have been identified as active ports as defined, for example, in amended claim 1. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, it is submitted that amended claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Colmenero, and is therefore believed to be allowable.

Independent claims 14, 26, and 38 define features similar to those defined in claim 1, and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least those reasons stated above in support of claim 1. Additionally, dependent claims 2-13, 15-25, 27-37, and 38-51 are also believed to be allowable since they depend upon independent claims 1, 14, 26, and 38 respectively.

Claim 1 is rejected by the examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is being anticipated by McAlear (US6697372). This rejections is respectfully traversed.

The examiner states on page 5 of the office action that McAlear discloses automatically identifying active ports characterized by external load, and sequencing only desired active ports of the electronic device, citing column 3, lines 39-41 in support. This assertion is respectfully traversed. There is no teaching or suggestion in McAlear column 4, lines 39-41 of the features relating to the sequencing of only identified active ports of a sequencer as defined, for example, in amended claim 1.

Moreover, it is submitted that the teachings of McAlear represent non-analogous art since the teachings of McAlear are directed to a technique for interfacing peripheral devices to computers using a new serial bus standard known as Universal Serial Bus (USB). In contrast the present claimed invention, as defined, for example, in amended claim 1, is directed to a technique for automatically detecting active ports of a sequencer, and for sequencing only a first portion of ports of the sequencer which have been identified as active ports. It is submitted that one having ordinary skill in the art would not look to the teachings of McAlear (relating to interfacing of peripheral devices to computers using the Universal Serial Bus standard) for overcoming problems associated with conventional sequencer technology. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, it is submitted that amended claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of McAlear, and is therefore believed to be allowable.

Independent claims 14, 26, and 38 define features similar to those defined in claim 1, and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least those reasons stated above in support of claim 1. Additionally, dependent claims 2-13, 15-25, 27-37, and 38-51 are also believed to be allowable since they depend upon independent claims 1, 14, 26, and 38 respectively.

Claim 1 is rejected by the examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is being anticipated by Biebl (US 6515434). This rejections is respectfully traversed.

The examiner states on pages 9-10 of the office action that Biebl discloses automatically identifying active ports which are physically connected to an external load, citing column 3, lines 1-6 in support. This assertion is respectfully traversed. There is no teaching or suggestion in Biebl column 3, lines 1-6 of the features relating to automatic detection of active and/or inactive ports of a sequencer as defined, for example, in amended claim 1.

The examiner also states on pages 9-10 of the office action that Biebl discloses sequencing only desired active ports of the electronic device, citing column 2, lines 53-60 in support. This assertion is respectfully traversed. There is no teaching or suggestion in Biebl column 2, lines 53-60 of the feature relating to the sequencing of only a first portion of ports of the sequencer which have been identified as active ports as defined, for example, in amended

claim 1. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, it is submitted that amended claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Biebl, and is therefore believed to be allowable.

Independent claims 14, 26, and 38 define features similar to those defined in claim 1, and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least those reasons stated above in support of claim 1. Additionally, dependent claims 2-13, 15-25, 27-37, and 38-51 are also believed to be allowable since they depend upon independent claims 1, 14, 26, and 38 respectively.

Claim 1 is rejected by the examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is being anticipated by Bastiani et al. (US 6675243). This rejections is respectfully traversed.

The examiner states on page 13 of the office action that Bastiani et al. discloses automatically identifying active ports which are physically connected to an external load, citing column 33, line 37 in support. This assertion is respectfully traversed. There is no teaching or suggestion in Bastiani et al. column 33, line 37 of the features relating to automatic detection of active and/or inactive ports of a sequencer as defined, for example, in amended claim 1.

The examiner also states on page 13 of the office action that Bastiani et al. discloses sequencing only desired active ports of the electronic device, citing column 34, lines 16-17 in support. This assertion is respectfully traversed. There is no teaching or suggestion in Bastiani et al. column 34, lines 16-17 of the feature relating to the sequencing of only a first portion of ports of the sequencer which have been identified as active ports as defined, for example, in amended claim 1. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, it is submitted that amended claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Bastiani et al., and is therefore believed to be allowable.

Independent claims 14, 26, and 38 define features similar to those defined in claim 1, and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least those reasons stated above in support of claim 1. Additionally, dependent claims 2-13, 15-25, 27-37, and 38-51 are also believed to be allowable since they depend upon independent claims 1, 14, 26, and 38 respectively.

Because claims 1-51 are believed to be allowable in their present form, many of the examiner's rejections in the Office Action have not been addressed in this response. However, applicant respectfully reserves the right to respond to one or more of the examiner's rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dean E. Wolf
Registration No. 37,260